

**VIOLATIONS OF LEECH'S MAXIMS IN *HARRY POTTER AND THE  
CHAMBER OF SECRETS* MOVIE (2002)**



Submitted as Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for Getting Bachelor Degree of  
Education in English Department

by:

**DEVI PRATAMA PUTRI**

**A320130171**

**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH EDUCATION  
SCHOOL OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION  
MUHAMMADIYAH UNIVERSITY OF SURAKARTA**

**2018**

APPROVAL

VIOLATIONS OF LEECH'S MAXIMS IN *HARRY POTTER AND THE  
CHAMBER OF SECRETS* MOVIE (2002)

PUBLICATION ARTICLE

by:

**DEVI PRATAMA PUTRI**

A320130171

Approved by the Consultant



**Drs. Agus Wijayanto, M. A., Ph. D.**

NIDN. 0609096801

ACCEPTANCE

VIOLATIONS OF LEECH'S MAXIMS IN *HARRY POTTER AND THE  
CHAMBER OF SECRETS* MOVIE (2002)

PUBLICATION ARTICLE

by:

DEVI PRATAMA PUTRI

A320130171

Accepted by

The Board of Examiner School of Teache Training and Education  
Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta

Team of Examiner:

1. Drs. Agus Wijayanto, M. A., Ph. D.  
(Chair Person)
2. Dr. Malikatul Laila, M. Hum.  
(Member I)
3. Dra. Siti Zuhriah Ariatmi, M. Hum.  
(Member II)

(.....)

(.....)

(.....)

Surakarta, January 9<sup>th</sup>, 2018

Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta

School of Teacher Training and Education

Dean,



Prof. Dr. Harun Joko Prayitno, M. Hum.

NIP. 196504281993031001

## PRONOUNCEMENT

I am the researcher, signed on the statement bellow:

Name : Devi Pratama Putri  
Student Number : A320130171  
Study Program : Department of English Education  
Title : VIOLATIONS OF LEECH'S MAXIMS IN *HARRY POTTER AND THE CHAMBER OF SECRETS* MOVIE (2002)

Herewith, I testify in this publication article there is no plagiarism of the previous literary work which has been raised to obtain bachelor degree of university, nor there are options of masterpiece wich have been written or published by others, except those which are reffered to manuscript and mentioned in the literary review and bibliography.

If later, the result of this research is proved as plagiarism, I will be fully responsible and will accept sanction according to application regulation.

Surakarta, 1 November 2017

The writter,



Devi Pratama Putri

A320130171

## VIOLATIONS OF LEECH'S MAXIM IN *HARRY POTTER AND THE CHAMBER OF SECRETS* MOVIE (2002)

### Abstrak

*Penelitian ini membahas tentang pelanggaran maksim kesopanan. Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk menemukan pelanggaran maksim-maksim kesopanan dan menjelaskan alasan dari pelanggaran-pelanggaran maksim kesopanan yang ditunjukkan oleh tokoh-tokoh di film Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets. Penelitian ini merupakan penelitian deskriptif kualitatif. Data diperoleh dengan menggunakan metode dokumentasi. Data yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah kalimat-kalimat yang mengandung pelanggaran maksim kesopanan pada naskah film Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets. Data yang diperoleh dalam penelitian ini akan dianalisis berdasarkan prinsip kesopanan Leech (1983) Hasil dari penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa ditemukan pelanggaran terhadap keenam maksim kesopanan, yaitu pelanggaran maksim kebijaksanaan (tact maxim) dengan 13 data atau 29,5 %, pelanggaran maksim kedermawanan (generosity maxim) dengan 6 data atau 13,6 %, pelanggaran maksim penghargaan (approbation maxim) dengan 6 data atau 13,6 %, pelanggaran maksim kesederhanaan (modesty maxim) dengan 6 data atau 13,6 %, pelanggaran maksim kecocokan (agreement maxim) dengan 10 data atau 22,7 %, dan pelanggaran maksim kesimpatian (sympathy maxim) dengan 3 data atau 6,8 %. Hasil penelitian ini juga menemukan beberapa alasan dari pelanggaran-pelanggaran maksim kesopanan diantaranya adalah untuk mengekspresikan kekhawatiran, gangguan, kemarahan, ketidakpercayaan, ketidaksukaan, kesombongan, kekesalan, kepuasan, ketakutan, ketidaksetujuan, kepercayaan diri, untuk mencelakai, untuk memerintah, untuk melindungi, untuk menghina, dan untuk membual.*

**Kata Kunci:** prinsip kesopanan, maksim kesopanan, pelanggaran maksim

### Abstract

This research focuses on violations of politeness maxims. This research aims to find out violation of politeness maxims and to describe the intentions of maxim violations performed by the characters in *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets* movie. This research is descriptive qualitative research. The data are collected by using document review method. The data used in this study are in the form of utterances containing violations of politeness maxim in *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets* manuscript. The data found in this research are analyzed based on Politeness Principles proposed by Leech (1983). The result of this study showed that there are found violations on 6 politeness maxims, those are tact maxim with 13 data or 29,5 %, generosity maxim with 6 data or 13,6 %, approbation maxim with 6 data or 13,6 %, modesty maxim with 6 data or 13,6 %, agreement maxim with 10

data or 22,7 %, and sympathy maxim with 3 data or 46,8%. This study also showed that there are some intentions of maxim violations, those are to show worry, to show annoyance, to show anger, to express disbelief, to show dislike, to show arrogance, to show vexation, to express satisfaction, to express fear, to show disagreement, to show confidence, to harm, to command, to protect, to humiliate, and to boast.

**Keywords:** politeness principles, politeness maxims, maxim violation

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Language plays important role from human communication in daily life. There are so many purpose of language used by people in their interaction. By language people can express what are in their mind in accordance with its function. When someone says "I will come tomorrow," the function of that utterance is promising or when someone says "thank you", it functions as thanking. Communication is an implementation of the use of language in society. In daily communication, sometimes people say some words which have several possible meanings. When a person says "*It is so cold here.*" It can be inferred that what the speaker probably means is "*Close the windows!*" or "*Turn off the air conditioner, please.*" or "*Please, take the jacket for me.*" or "*I want to get a cup of hot tea.*" Thomas (1995:1) states an utterance the speaker says can be meant for so many different meanings in certain time and place. Studying pragmatics will help listeners understand the meaning intended by speakers and the action performed by speakers during communication. As stated by Mey (2001:6), pragmatics as a study of language use in human communication is based on provision of the social condition occurred in society.

In communication with others, people understand how to maintain good communication. They often observe their attitudes, behaviors, and word choices when they speak in order to maintain good manners and not to make their friend talks feel uncomfortable, irritated, or ashamed. Everyday, people communicate each other with different purposes and in different situation. When we are talking with our parents, teachers, older people, or strangers, we tend to speak formally and often control our attitude not to do impoliteness, talk something taboo, swearing, or anything can make the listener feels embarrassed, upset,

and annoyed. In this case, politeness is very important to be noticed in human communication.

Sometimes, people do a mistake in their speaking and create a conflict between the participants. It can happen because the speaker does a rudeness or speaks impolitely. When information is delivered inappropriately, the hearer may be embarrassed or humiliated by the speaker, and this is called impoliteness. Dealing with politeness, Geoffrey Leech (1983) proposes some principles of politeness that can manage the stability in daily social life. He composes six maxims of politeness that determines what should be done by both speaker to act politely. Those maxims are the tact maxim, the generosity maxim, the approbation maxim, the modesty maxim, the agreement maxim, and the sympathy maxim. Each maxim has some characteristics, as follows:

1.1. Tact Maxim

Minimize cost to other; maximize benefit to other.

1.2. Generosity Maxim

Minimize benefit to self; maximize cost to self.

1.3. Approbation Maxim

Minimize dispraise to other; maximize praise to other.

1.4. Modesty Maxim

Minimize praise to self; maximize dispraise to self.

1.5. Agreement Maxim

Minimize disagreement between self and other; maximize agreement between self to other.

1.6. Sympathy Maxim

Minimize antipathy between self and other; maximize sympathy between self to other.

However, people often fail to observe those maxims, it is called violation. Violation is a process of disobeying one or more criteria of a maxim. Violating of politeness maxims is interested to be studied because politeness is an essential part in communication with the others and not infrequently, disobeying of politeness maxims is done during the communication. It can

happens with or without realizing it. It might be because the participants tend to be less formal in their communication, or there are very close relationship between the participants.

There were some previous studies which investigated about violating politeness maxims. Robihun (2009) conducted a research which was focused on politeness maxim analysis. The research found that there were many violations of politeness maxims. Those were the tact maxim, the approbation maxim, the modesty maxim, and the agreement maxim. In the research there was not found the generosity and the sympathy maxims. The research also showed that violating politeness maxim could result impoliteness. Handayani (2013) investigated the violation of politeness principle in cellular phone provider. The result of the study proved that there were violating maxims in 12 data found from the provider advertisement. Types of maxim violation were violation of tact maxim, violation of generosity maxim, violation of approbation maxim, violation of modesty maxim, violation of agreement maxim, and violation of sympathy maxim.

This study intended to extend the previous studies. It attempt to answer the problem statements: what are types of the Leech's maxim violated by the characters in *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets* movie?; and what are the reasons of violating the Leech's maxim performed by the characters in *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets* movie?

## **2. RESEARCH METHOD**

This research is descriptive qualitative research. The object of this study is the utterances said by the character in *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets* movie which contain violating Leech's maxims. The data are collected by using document review method. Then, the data analysis uses content analysis method. In analyzing the data, the researcher uses some theories. To analyze types of maxim violation is based on Politeness Principle proposed by Leech (1983) and to analyze the intentions of maxim violations uses theory of Searle



(1969) which is also supported with Hyme's theory of Ethnography of Communication (1974) to describe detail situation of communication.

### 3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The researcher had found 44 data consisting of conversation which contains the violation of Leech's maxims performed by the characters in *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets* movie. Different with the definition of violating that is stated by Grice that the speaker who violates a maxim is intended to lie to mislead hearer or creating illusive implicature, the term of violation in this research is a disobedience of a maxim by breaking one of the maxim criteria or more.

**Datum01/HP2/0009/TM (00:01:36,613 - 00:01:51,149)**

Harry : I can't let you out, Hedwig. I'm not allowed to use magic outside of school. Besides, if Uncle Vernon—

Vernon : Harry Potter!

Harry : Now you've done it.

Petunia : He's in there. Vernon?

Vernon : I'm warning you, if you can't control that bloody bird, it'll have to go.

Harry : But she's bored. If I could only let her out for an hour or two.

Vernon : **So you can send secret messages to your freaky little friends? No, sir.**

The type of maxim that was violated by Vernon in the conversation above was tact maxim. The sentences "**So you can send secret messages to your freaky little friends? No, sir.**" showed disagreement to Harry's request that if he could let his bird out of the cage for several hour. He speculated that Harry would use that bird to send messages to his wizard friends. From the statement, it minimized benefit to Harry. In wizarding world, owl was used to deliver post for communicating between wizards. If Hedwig (Harry's owl) was not allowed to get out, Harry could not send any message to his friends. The

statement above implied that Vernon did not like anything about magic, he did not allow magical things around his place because he was very proud of being normal and presumed someone like Harry and his stuffs as an abnormality. The impolite implicature was showed from Vernon's disagreement to let Harry took his owl out of the cage. Based on the context of conversation, the intention of violating tact maxim was to show dislike.

**Datum39/HP2/1461-1463/GM (02:19:59,265 - 02:20:20,848)**

Harry : And why did you want to meet me?

Tom : **I knew I had to talk to you, meet you if I could. So I decided to show you my capture oaf that brainless oaf Hagrid to gain your trust.**

Harry : Hagrid's my friend. And you framed him, didn't you?

Tom : It was my word against Hagrid's. Only Dumbledore seemed to think he was innocent.

The statement **“I knew I had to talk to you, meet you if I could. So I decided to show you my capture of that brainless oaf Hagrid to gain your trust.”** showed that Tom maximized benefit to him. Through his diary, Tom showed the incident 50 years ago when the Chamber of Secrets was opened and the monster from the chamber had killed a muggle-born (Moaning Myrtle). The chamber was actually opened by Tom (Voldemort), but he slandered Hagrid and his pet as the suspect behind the incident. It gave benefit to Tom because Harry had thought that Hagrid was the one who opened and released a monster inside the chamber, it made Harry trusted him as good person and disguised his real identity as Voldemort and the Heir of Slytherin who opened the Chamber of Secrets. The utterance **“I knew I had to talk to you, meet you if I could....”** also implied that Tom (Voldemort) wanted to kill Harry because he was not able to kill him when he was one year old and made him lost his power and then he would return to kill Harry,

his new target. Then the utterance “**So I decided to show you my capture of that brainless oaf Hagrid to gain your trust.**” implied that Hagrid actually was not guilty over the attack 50 years ago. So, the type of maxim violated by Tom was the generosity maxim. The impolite implicature of the utterance was Tom blamed Hagrid for his action to make Harry trust him and could meet Harry to kill him. Based on the context of conversation, the intention of violating generosity maxim was to harm.

**Datum14/HP2/0282-0286/APM (00:24:43,056 - 00:25:29,398)**

Lucius : Busy time at the Ministry, Arthur, all those extra raids? I do hope they're paying you overtime, but judging by the state of this, I'd say not. What's the use in being a disgrace to the name of wizard if they don't even pay you well for it?

Arthur : We have a very different idea about what disgraces the name of wizard, Malfoy.

Lucius : Clearly. **Associating with Muggles. And I thought your family could sink no lower.** I'll see you at work.

The statement said by Lucius failed to observe the approbation maxim where it maximized dispraise and minimized praise to other. Arthur was an employee in the Misuse of Muggle Artifacts Office at the Ministry of Magic. He loved muggles and was curious about them. Lucius Malfoy humiliated Arthur Weasley by saying “**...Associating with Muggles. And I thought your family could sink no lower.**” The statement showed that Arthur had been humiliating the wizards because of making friend with muggles. For Lucius, being friend with muggles was a shame and did not like anything about them. “**... I thought your family could sink no lower.**” the statement showed Lucius also insulted Arthur that status of Arthur’s family had severely slumped. Based on the context of conversation, the intention of violating approbation maxim was to humiliate.

**Datum16/HP2/0476/MM (00:44:36,885 - 00:44:52,895)**

Harry : Malfoy?

Draco : That's right. And that's not all that's new this year.

Ron : Those are Nimbus 2001 s. How did you get those?

Flint : A gift from Draco's father.

Draco : You see, Weasley, unlike some, **my father can afford the best.**

Type of maxim violated by Draco was the modesty maxim. His statement showed minimizing dispraise and maximizing praise to him. The statement “You see, Weasley, unlike some, **my father can afford the best.**” Represented commendation to himself that his father could provide anything the best for him. The statement directly addressed to Ron that also showed a teasing because Ron’s father might not be able to buy those broomstick for him. It clearly showed that Draco intended to say about fortune of his family. Based on the context of situation, the intention of violating modesty maxim was to show arrogance.

**Datum21/HP2/0676/AGM (01:04:13,120 - 01:04:54,324)**

Hermione : Are you okay?

Harry : No. I think my arm is broken.

Lockhart : Not to worry, Harry. I will fix that arm of yours straightaway.

Harry : **Not you.**

Lockhart : Boy doesn't know what he's saying. This won't hurt a bit. Brackium Emendo! Yes, well, that can sometimes happen, but the point is you can no longer feel any pain, and, very clearly, the bones are not broken.

From the dialogue above, Harry showed disagreement to Lockhart. By saying “**Not you.**” he refused Lockhart’s help. It also implied that he did not believe that Lockhart was able to cure his arm. His refusal represented disagreement to Lockhart’s statement that offered

a help to Harry. So, type of maxim violated by Harry was the disagreement maxim because he maximized disagreement and minimized agreement between himself and Lockhart. Based on the context of situation, the intention of violating agreement maxim was to show disbelief.

**Datum30/HP2/1004-1015/SM (01:33:43,476 - 01:34:54,906)**

Draco : What? You think there's someone here who's worse than Dumbledore? Well? Do you?

Harry : Harry Potter?

Draco : What? You think there's someone here who's worse than Dumbledore? Well? Do you?

Harry : Harry Potter?

Draco : Good one, Goyle. You're absolutely right. Saint Potter. And people actually think that he's the Heir of Slytherin?

Harry : But then you must have some idea who's behind it all.

Draco : You know I don't, Goyle. I told you yesterday. How many times do I have to tell you? Is s this yours? But my father did say this: It's been 50 years since the Chamber was opened. He wouldn't tell me who opened it. Only that they were expelled. The last time the Chamber of Secrets was opened, a Mudblood died. **So it's only a matter of time before one of them is killed this time. As for me I hope it's Granger.**

From the statement said by Draco, it was known that he maximized antipathy and minimized empathy to other. Because the Chamber of Secrets had been opened it meant that Muggle-born students was in danger. By stating "**So it's only a matter of time before one of them is killed this time. As for me I hope it's Granger.**" Draco hoped that Hermione, a Muggle-born would be killed by the incident. The statement implied that he did not have empathy over the incident that might endanger his friend's life. It could be implied that he was excited

if Hermione died. So the maxim violated by Draco was the sympathy maxim. Based on the context of situation, the intention of violating sympathy maxim was to show dislike.

Table 1. Percentage amount table of types of violating Leech's Maxims

NO	TYPE OF MAXIM VIOLATION	QUANTITY	PERCENTAGE
1	TACT MAXIM	13	29,5 %
2	GENEROSITY MAXIM	6	13,6 %
3	APPROBATION MAXIM	6	13,6 %
4	MODESTY MAXIM	6	13,6 %
5	AGREEMENT MAXIM	10	22,7 %
6	SYMPATHY MAXIM	3	6,8 %
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>44</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based on the research findings, the most dominant maxim which is violated in *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets* is the tact maxim. Tact maxim violation happens when the speaker disobeys the belief of minimizing cost and maximizing benefits to other. There are found 13 data or 29,5% of the tact maxim. The second dominant maxim is the agreement maxim with 10 data found or 22,7%. The violation of agreement maxim happens when the speaker maximizes disagreement and minimizes agreement between self and other. In the third dominant maxim, there are three types of maxims. Those are the approbation maxim with 6 data found or 13,6%, the generosity maxim with 6 data found or 13,6%, and the modesty maxim with 6 data found or 13,6 %. The violation of approbation maxim happens when the speaker maximizes dispraise and minimizes praise to other. The generosity maxim with is violated when the speaker maximizes benefit and minimizes cost to self. The modesty maxim is violated when the speaker maximizes praise and minimizes dispraise to self. Then, the last is the sympathy maxim with 2 data found or 6,8%. The sympathy

maxim violation happens when the speaker does not follow the belief of minimizing antipathy and maximizing empathy to other.

Table 2. Intention of Maxim Violation

NO.	INTENTION	TYPE OF MAXIMS	QUANTITY
1.	Showing Worry	Tact Maxim	2
		Agreement Maxim	1
		Generosity Maxim	2
2.	Showing Annoyance	Tact Maxim	1
3.	Showing Anger	Tact Maxim	4
		Sympathy Maxim	1
4.	Showing Vexation	Tact Maxim	1
5.	Expressing Satisfaction	Generosity Maxim	1
6.	Showing Dislike	Tact Maxim	1
		Approbation Maxim	1
		Agreement Maxim	2
		Sympathy Maxim	1
7.	Showing Arrogance	Modesty Maxim	5
8.	Expressing Disbelief	Approbation Maxim	1
		Agreement Maxim	2
9.	To Harm	Tact Maxim	1
		Generosity Maxim	2
		Agreement Maxim	1
10.	Expressing Fear	Agreement Maxim	1
		Sympathy Maxim	1
11.	To Command	Tact Maxim	2
		Generosity Maxim	1
12.	Showing Confidence	Modesty Maxim	1
13.	Showing Disagreement	Agreement Maxim	2
14.	To Protect	Tact Maxim	1
15.	To Hide Something	Agreement Maxim	1
16.	To Humiliate	Approbation Maxim	3
17.	Boasting	Approbation Maxim	1
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>44</b>

The table above also showed the intentions of maxim violation. They are to show worry, to show annoyance, to show anger, to express disbelief, to show dislike, to harm, to show arrogance, to show vexation, to express satisfaction, to express fear, to command, to protect, to humiliate, to show disagreement, to boast, and to show confidence. First, the intentions of showing worry could be triggered by violating tact maxim, generosity maxim, and

agreement maxim. Second, the intention of showing annoyance could be triggered by violating tact maxim. Third, the intention of showing anger could be triggered by violating tact maxim and sympathy maxim. Fourth, the intention of showing vexation could be triggered by violating tact maxim. Fifth, the intention of expressing satisfaction could be triggered by violating generosity maxim. Sixth, the intention of showing dislike could be triggered by violating tact maxim, approbation maxim, agreement maxim, and sympathy maxim. Seventh, expression of arrogance could be triggered by violating modesty maxim. Eighth, expression of disbelief could be triggered by violating approbation maxim and agreement maxim. Ninth, the intention of harming others could be triggered by violating tact maxim, generosity maxim, and agreement maxim. Tenth, expressing fear could be triggered by violating agreement maxim and sympathy maxim. Eleventh, the intention of commanding others could be triggered by violating tact maxim and generosity maxim. Twelfth, the intention of showing confidence could be triggered by violating modesty maxim. Thirteenth, the intention of showing disagreement could be triggered by violating agreement maxim. Fourteenth, the intention of protecting other could be triggered by violating tact maxim. Fifteenth, the intention of hiding something could be triggered by violating agreement maxim. Sixteenth, the intention of humiliating other could be triggered by violating approbation maxim. Seventeenth, the intention of boasting could be triggered by violating approbation maxim.

Based on the data analysis, the intention of violating maxim that mostly appears in *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets* is showing worry, showing anger, showing dislike, and showing arrogance.

#### **4. CONCLUSION**

Based on data analysis by using theory of Politeness Principles by Leech (1983), the data containing maxim violation in *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets*, there are six types of Leech's maxim which were violated by the characters. Those are violation of tact maxim, violation of generosity



maxim, violation of approbation maxim, violation of modesty maxim, violation of agreement maxim, and violation of sympathy maxim. The data show that the characters tend to violate the tact maxim.

Based on context of conversation, there are various intentions of violating Leech's maxims. First, there are intentions to express negative feeling such worry, annoyance, anger, vexation, dislike, arrogance, disbelief, fear, disagreement to harm, to humiliate, and to boast, . There is also intention to express positive feeling such as confidence, satisfaction, to command, and to protect. The intention of Leech's maxim violation that mostly intended by the speaker is showing worry, showing anger, showing dislike, and showing arrogance.

The result of data analysis shows that violating Leech maxims could produce impoliteness. It is depended on the intention of maxim violation done by speaker and the effect towards listener caused by that maxim violation.

## 5. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Fandom. (n.d). "Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets." San Francisco: Fandom Powered by Wikia. Retrieved July 12, 2017. ([http://www.harrypotter.wikia.com/wiki/Harry\\_Potter\\_and\\_the\\_Chamber\\_of\\_Secrets\\_\(film\)\)](http://www.harrypotter.wikia.com/wiki/Harry_Potter_and_the_Chamber_of_Secrets_(film))))
- Handayani, Tuti. 2013. " Violating Politeness Principles in Cellular Phone Provider." Article. English Department, Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University, Semarang.
- Leech, Geoffrey N. 1983. *Principle of Pragmatics*. New York, USA: Longman.
- Mey, Jacob L. 2001. *Pragmatics an Introduction*, 2nd edition. Maldon, USA: Blackwell.
- Robihun, Wahyu. 2009. "A Politeness Maxims Analysis on the Dialogue of America's Presidential Candidate Debate." Research Paper. English

Letter Department, Letters and Humanities Faculty, State Islamic  
University Syarif Hidayatullah, Jakarta.

Thomas, Jenny. 1995. *Meaning in Interaction: an Introduction to Pragmatics*.  
New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.